## II. REMARKS

Amin relates to a system, wherein a voice mail notification is delivered to a subscriber of a voice mail system to indicate that a voice mail message is waiting in a subscriber mailbox (abstract). This type of method has already been recognized as prior art in the present specification (page 2, lines 5-8).

In Kasper, a flag is set in a feature data base, when a voice message addressed to a user is stored in a voice mail system. Responsive to the set flag, an audible notification of existing voice message is issued to the user, when the user originates a call or answers an incoming call. The flag is cleared when the voice message is retrieved or when the user originates a call. (ABSTRACT; col. 6, lines 10-23)

Claim 1 of the present patent application states *"erasing from the memory of the terminal said notification message in response to a* ***specific procedure relating to contacting*** *[a specific address from the terminal]"*.

Amin is silent about erasing the notification message as the Examiner has admitted.

Kasper does not teach storing a notification message. Moreover, Kasper does not concern terminal operation in any way, and specifically, Kasper does not teach storing anything in a terminal. Thus, Kasper cannot teach "erasing from the memory of the terminal said notification message in response to a specific procedure relating to said contacting" specified in claim 1. Kasper teaches only clearing a flag in a data base associated with the DCS which resides in the network (Figure 1; col. 3,

lines 49-50), the flag indicating that a notification of voice messages needs to be sent to the user.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has ignored the fact that in claim 1 a notification message is stored in a terminal and the connection on the basis of which the notification message is erased originates from the same device. Whereas in Kasper, a flag is set in a network element and the connection on the basis of which the flag is cleared originates from the mobile subscriber, i.e., from a separate device (paragraph 3, lines 49-50 and 65-66). Kasper does not indicate any reason for having these operations in the same device. Thus, a person skilled in the art would not have had any motivation for erasing a notification message from a user terminal on the basis of Kasper.

Further, with regard to Kasper, having a flag set does not have any causal relation to opening a connection on the basis of which the flag is cleared. That is, the mobile subscriber in Kasper does not know whether a flag is set or not before opening a connection, whereas in claim 1 the connection is opened specifically on the basis of the notification message.

The aim of Amin and Kasper seems to be assuring that a subscriber of a cellular network receives all waiting messages, whereas one of the aims of the present invention is to alleviate the burden of manually erasing notification messages by automatically erasing unnecessary notification messages. Amin and Kasper do not even hint that automatically erasing a notification message in a terminal would be necessary.

Thus, a person skilled in the art would not have looked at Amin and Kasper when trying to solve the problem solved by claim 1. Hence these references cannot be combined.

Even if one would have looked at Amin and Kasper, the combination of their teachings would not have lead to the present invention since neither of them gives a hint for erasing a notification message in a terminal, which is one of the main ideas of the present invention. Instead, the combination of Amin and Kasper would lead to an arrangement, wherein, if a flag is set in a feature data base in a network element, a notification message to be stored in a terminal, instead of an audible notification, would be sent to a user, when the user originates a call or answers an incoming call. And the flag in the network element would be cleared, when the voice messages are retrieved or when the user originates a call. However, the notification messages stored in the terminal would still need to be manually erased by the user.

Thus the rejection of claims 1-4, 7 and 13-16 under 35 USC 103 over Amin in view of Kasper should be withdrawn.

Similarly, Kaisto fails to disclose the above feature of erasing a notification message from the terminal; thus combining it with the above references does not result in the invention of claim 1. Hence the rejection of claims 9-12 under 35 USC 103 on this combination of references should be withdrawn.

Further, Narasawa fails to disclose the above feature. Thus the rejection of claims 5, 6 and 8 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Sept 21, 2004
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 9/21/04

Signature: Doris W Penna
Person Making Deposit